REMARKS

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Summary of Discussion with Examiner

Applicants' representative telephoned the Examiner on November 27, 2008 to discuss the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants appreciate the Examiner taking the time to review the rejection and discuss it with Applicants' representative. Upon review of the rejection, and discussing the same with Applicants' representative, the Examiner indicated that she was withdrawing this rejection. Applicants thank the Examiner for her kind reconsideration of this issue.

Claim Amendments

Claims 3, 7 and 13 have been amended to replace "pentenyl" with "4-pentenyl". Support for this amendment is found on page 11, line 12 of Applicants' specification.

Claims 3, 6-9, 10 and 13 have been amended to correct the spelling of "trimethylsilyl".

Claims 3, 6, 7, 9 and 13 have been amended to replace "NO₂" with "ONO₂". Support for this amendment is found in the title compound of example (E) described on page 21 of Applicants' specification, since a nitrate means "ONO₂".

Claims 4, 8 and 14 have been amended to provide a formula for the protective asparagines. Support for this amendment is found in both the specification (page 6, line 5) and the claims (claim 8).

Claim 3 has also been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 2, as a result of which claim 2 has been cancelled, without prejudice.

Claim 13 has also been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 11 and 12, as a result of which claims 11 and 12 have been cancelled, without prejudice.

Lastly, claim 5 has also been cancelled, without prejudice.

No new matter has been added to the application by these amendments.

Claim Objections

The objection to claims 2-14 has been rendered moot in view of the above-discussed claim amendments.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The rejection of claims 3, 7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, has been rendered moot by the above-discussed claim amendments.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The rejection of claims 2, 11, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been rendered moot by the above-discussed claim amendments, and by the discussion with the Examiner. [The Examiner withdrew the rejection of claim 13, as is discussed in detail above.]

Additionally, the rejection of claims 2-14, and the rejection of claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph have been rendered moot by the above-discussed claim amendments.

Patentability Arguments

The patentability of the present invention over the disclosures of the references relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims will be apparent upon consideration of the above-discussed amendments and the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bolem et al. in view of Yamazaki et al. has been rendered moot by the cancellation of this claim.

The rejection of claims 5 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Usui et al. in view of Yamazaki et al. has been rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims.

Shinichiro NISHIMURA et al. Attorney Docket No. 2006_0977A Serial No. 10/584,065 November 28, 2008

et al. in view of Greene et al. is respectfully traversed

The Position of the Examiner

The rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takatani

The Examiner takes the position that Takatani et al. teach compounds 39-42, which differ

from the compounds of claim [8] in that they contain allyl and TBDPS protecting groups, which

are not included in claim [8]. [We note that the Examiner refers to claim 8 in the discussion of

this rejection. However, we presume that the Examiner intended to refer to claim 10, based on

the statement of rejection.]

The Examiner indicates that Greene et al. teach that allyl ethers have similar reactivity to

other hydroxy protecting groups, including methoxymethyl and tetrahydropyaranyl.

Thus, the Examiner takes the position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute protecting groups having similar

reactivity for the ones taught by Takatani et al.

Applicants' Arguments

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position for the following reasons.

The trisaccharide derivatives of Takatani et al., as shown in the Office Action, have

structures as follows:

left compounds:

Manβ1→4G1cNAcα1→4G1cNAc

compounds 39 and 41

right compounds:

Manα1→4G1cNAcβ1→4G1cNAc

compounds 40 and 42

On the contrary, Applicants' claim 10 recites a trisaccharide compound (a type of

Man β 1 \rightarrow 4G1cNP1 β 1 \rightarrow 4G1cNP², shown by recited formula (III).

A technical feature of Applicants' invention is to provide a trisaccharide compound

having two $\beta 1 \rightarrow 4$ bonds, and protecting groups are not as important. As described on page 2,

14

Shinichiro NISHIMURA et al. Attorney Docket No. 2006_0977A Serial No. 10/584,065 November 28, 2008

line 9 to page 3, line 3 of Applicants' specification, it was quite difficult to prepare a sugar chain

connecting through $\beta 1 \rightarrow 4$ bonds.

Further the trisaccharide of Applicants' invention is useful to prepare the asparagine-

linked sugar chain. On the contrary, it was not possible to prepare the same using the sugar chain

disclosed in Takatani et al.

The Greene et al. reference is merely relied upon for the discussion regarding protecting

groups. Therefore, Greene et al. fail to remedy the deficiencies of the primary reference.

For these reasons, the invention of claim 10 is clearly patentable over cited combination

of references. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of

the grounds of objection and rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the

application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining

which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is

respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Shinichiro NISHIMURA et al.

Amy E/Schmic

Registration No. 55,965

Attorney for Applicants

AES/emj

Washington, D.C. 20006-1021

Telephone (202) 721-8200

Facsimile (202) 721-8250

November 28, 2008

15